

M. LIBRARY
AM BLDG.
ETROIT

22 1951

February 1951

CHILD WELFARE

JOURNAL OF

THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

VOLUME XXX • NUMBER 2

price 35 cents

CHILD WELFARE

JOURNAL OF THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, Inc.

Published Monthly except August and September, by the Child Welfare League of America

• HENRIETTA L. GORDON, Editor

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION \$3.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

Child Welfare is a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems and the programs and skills needed to solve them. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

CHECKS PAYABLE TO Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

24 West 40th Street, New York 18, N.Y.

CONTENTS

PAGE

Children's Agencies and Today's Family	3
Professional Training for Child Welfare from the Point of View of the Agency	6
Editorial Comments	
Defense Related Activities	10
Consultation Services in Nursery Schools	11
Conferences	17
Book Notes	17
Classified Ad Service	19

COMMITTEES ON PUBLICATIONS

MRS. RICHARD L. BOWDITCH, Board Member, Children's Aid Association, Boston, Mass.

Policy Committee

MRS. GEORGE P. EDMONDS
E. MARGUERITE GANE

MRS. JOE HUME GARDNER
MRS. HENRY HITCHCOCK

REV. JOHN J. LENNON
SOPHIE VAN S. THEIS

Advisory Committee

SALLIE E. BRIGHT Executive Director, National Publicity Council for Health and Welfare, New York, N. Y.
MRS. CLEVELAND B. CHASE Board Member, St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
MRS. BERNICE W. FRECHTMAN Head of Volunteer Services, Jewish Board of Guardians, New York, N. Y.
DR. ROMAN L. HAREMSKI Director, Children's Division, City of Chicago Department of Welfare, Chicago, Ill.
DOROTHY HUTCHINSON Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, New York, N. Y.
ADELAIDE KAISER Director, Hillside Children's Center, Rochester, N. Y.
FRIEDA M. KUHLMANN Executive Secretary, Children's Aid Society, Newark, N. J.
MARY LOIS PYLES Consultant, U.S. Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C.
FRED A. SCHUMACHER Executive Director, St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
VERNE WEED Assistant Executive Director, Children's Services of Conn., Hartford, Conn.
RUTH WEISENBARGER Assistant Director, Sheltering Arms Children's Service, New York, N. Y.
HELEN M. WHEELER Director, South End Day Nursery, Boston, Mass.

CHILDREN'S AGENCIES AND TODAY'S FAMILY*

Lester B. Granger

Executive Secretary
National Urban League
New York City

Organized Bigness and the fear of war have created an atmosphere in which the family is no longer able to provide alone the basic things every child wants—safety and fun. The writer calls for a co-ordinated effort focused on changing this atmosphere as well as on the needs of the individual child.

AS this Conference will give the technicians—the board and staff members of children's agencies—plenty of chance for examination from the insider's point of view, I see my assignment as calling for presentation of the interested outsider's opinion. Not too much of an outsider, at that, for the National Urban League, as a community organization agency, is constantly at work on the fringes of professional care for children, and we are bound to acquire information and develop opinions directly pertinent to child welfare and the family. It is true that our program is aimed directly at serving the welfare of our nation's largest disadvantaged minority, but that concentration of concern gives us an excellent opportunity to gain a "worm's-eye view" of American life. We must be especially sensitive to social and economic pressures felt by those who are not always able to fend for themselves—and that includes not only the economically deprived and the culturally stunted, but also the very old and the very young.

In speaking of "Children's Agencies and Today's Family," the key word is "today." It is *today's* family with which we are concerned, as we recognize the tremendous impact that a ten years' depression, five years of war and five years more of war fears have had upon our social life in all its forms. One of the results of that impact has been the increase of Organized Bigness, with a consequent decrease in the authority of unorganized influence. I think it is worth while to emphasize this almost universal expansion of accumulated power. During the depression all of our private and voluntary facilities for protecting wage-earners against loss of their incomes and savings, for giving relief to the destitute, for propping up financial structures in danger of crumbling, proved grossly inadequate in face of critical needs. There was no alternative to the prompt and large-scale entrance into the picture of the federal and state governments. The size of government operations swelled and swelled; the depression was ended only by the outbreak of war, and this large-scale organization of our

national resources to meet a different kind of crisis intensified the size and rate of government growth. Today Big Government is with us to stay, and the relationship of every individual to his government has been drastically altered by this fact.

Organized labor has also grown, until it is now in a position to control elections, to affect the price level almost overnight—to stall the nation's economic machinery or accelerate its production. Business and industry, together with finance, have had a spectacular growth of their own. The year 1929 and the years immediately following almost completely wrecked our economic structure and brought business, industry and finance into such perilous circumstances that for a while they seemed to form "a disadvantaged minority" of a special kind. NRA with its encouragement toward monopoly gave an initial, temporary relief. Then came the National Defense Act and the subsequent organizing of American industry into the most powerful offensive weapon the world has ever known. Planes, tanks, battleships and battle equipment streamed off assembly lines at a rate that confounded our enemies and amazed even experienced American economists and engineers. Big Industry was imperatively needed for victory, and we met the challenge with the same nonchalant genius that has brought forth other miracles of production throughout our national history. Industry means jobs and income and production—as well as exploitative monopoly or higher living standards, political corruption or progressive communities. But no matter which of these it is, industry is alive and has an instinct to stay alive—and growing. Like business and finance, Big Industry is here to stay, barring some economic disaster or political miracle.

So here we have the offspring of Organized Bigness—Big Government, Big Labor and Big Industry. It is only realistic to recognize that their creation has radically affected the income, personal initiative and opportunity of the wage-earner—and therefore of the wage-earner's family. One doesn't have to be a stubborn exponent of "rugged individualism" to recognize this. One has only to remember that the muscle not

* From an address presented at the League's annual dinner, National Conference of Social Work, April, 1950.

used becomes weak—that today's vestigial remnant is yesterday's characteristic that lost its place in the changing scheme of things.

Family Today Under Burden of Mass Insecurity

It is necessary for social work in general, and children's agencies in particular, to keep in mind these altered conditions under which today's families live. To forget them, to refer to social conditions as they were in the late Twenties or early Thirties, is to place our services on a false footing and thereby fail to meet the real needs of the families we serve. Very few families have adjusted satisfactorily to this altered social-economic scheme. Some, robotlike, are fumbling to find their place and drop submissively into it. But most families have reacted with bitter resentment or pervasive fear—and fear is the usual reaction, even though it is frequently unconscious. They feel as if they were on a huge Ferris wheel that has turned, thus far, fairly regularly but which always offers the threat of stopping suddenly and leaving them stranded in midair, or whirling loose and tossing them off into space. It's a different feeling, this one of mass insecurity, from that of personal insecurity that was felt, for instance, in the period after World War I. Then, the recurrence of war was simply not contemplated and did not corrode all social thought and action. Even the unemployed wage-earner somehow felt that he had a chance to deal personally with his difficulties—even when that chance in the end proved to be a pathetically hopeless one. Today, among far too many families, the wage-earner is resigned to the need of pooling his chance with that of his fellows, but generally shows no appreciation of ways in which he might work with his fellows to improve the chances of all.

Why do I dwell at such length on these broad social effects of economic change? It is because family life and the family atmosphere affecting children have absorbed this general mood, and thereby condition the effectiveness of every service that children's agencies seek to offer. Young people from childhood through adolescence have two major concerns—to feel safe and to have fun. It is difficult to have fun at a funeral; it is impossible to feel safe on the edge of a smoldering volcano. It is important that children realize these objectives, for their search after fun, if properly directed, enhances their sound physical growth, and their achievement of a feeling of security insures their emotional and mental growth.

As an interested—and somewhat brash—"outsider," I can't escape the baffled feeling that somehow in our concern for the particular needs of children such as health, vocational guidance, religious

training and supervised recreation, we have failed to center our attention sufficiently on their general craving for safety and fun. The other night I discussed with Dr. Martha Eliot and Joe Hoffer their observations at the Peckham Health Center in England—that interesting experiment that seeks to answer the question, "What is good health?" The hub of the Peckham Center's program is the mammoth glass-enclosed swimming pool to which family groups resort, at first for recreation and later as an introduction to use of the Center's health services. While they are enjoying themselves, they are being studied, and while they learn they make use of health facilities and develop sound constitutions and habits of health.

I wonder if study of this example, which is a curiously unorthodox but successful *mélange* of casework, group work and community organization, will not produce the key to our own approach to the overall needs of children in American society. By centering our attention on the child's instinctive desires, can we not detect more readily the points at which those desires—and therefore needs—remain unmet, and reorganize our over-all professional approach to cover unmet areas? It is a question which I shall not attempt to answer. My brashness does not carry me that far. If the point, however, has any validity, it argues for a shifting of the center of our co-ordinated children's efforts from the local equivalent of the social service exchange to some area or agency in which we have a chance to meet children and their families *before* and not *after* they are referred to special services. This might be the settlement house or community center. It might be the community school, or a new kind of recreational program. It would not be the children's agency nor the welfare department nor the children's court.

Social Work Faced with Increased Lack of Funds

Such a broad dispersal of our attention might not, and probably would not, in a particular sense, contribute to the perfection of the technical skills that are distinctive to the field of child care. Nor would it meet the needs of the individual child who requires foster home care or the services of a psychiatrist. But possibly this is a period (outrageous blasphemy!) in which we need temporarily to suspend intensive attention to these needs—not because they are any less pressing, but because we must make the best possible disposal of our too-limited professional resources. We may as well face the fact that for several years to come social work, whether voluntary or public, will be hard put to it to find financial resources for carrying on even its present scope of operations. The calculated shrinkage in expected community chest cam-

paign goals has increased within the past two years. Harassed administrators of federal, state and local public agencies find their appeals for adequate appropriations falling on indifferent ears as legislators and budget officers thoughtfully whet the blades of their pruning axes. And all of this is during a period that is witnessing the after-effects of a dramatic, widespread wartime migration. Those of us who read Mrs. Agnes Meyer's *America in Chaos*, which was a vivid description of the higgledy-piggledy mess developing in many of our cities as a result of unplanned, sudden migration, may remember that she predicted much of what has happened in the four and a half years following V-J day. The social and economic stranding of many families who hopefully followed war jobs is symbolized by the drab deterioration of wartime housing projects in a number of former war-industry cities that I have visited during the past two years. The failure of local officials and civic leaders to make any effective provision for rehousing the tenants of these sleazy quarters is producing a series of nasty slums that are all the more dangerous because their presence has not yet been fully recognized. What hope is there for children in such environments as these slums produce? Is there any way in which the child care agency can rearrange its services so as to reach out, in teamwork with other agencies in the community, to give these children the "fun and safety" upon which their futures will be founded? It took a costly flood that swept away homes and smothered human lives to get rid of the worst of Portland, Oregon's, Vanport section. I have an idea, however, that Portland will find, some years from now, that the flood also swept away the seeds of a foul problem that would have bloomed in future crime, disease and broken lives. Can we not search out similar seeds in other communities, and sweep them away without the costly effects of fire or flood?

Suggestions such as these may be unrealistic in view of the structure and special responsibility of the child care agency, when considered as a single organization. But I am considering, not one agency or a few agencies, but the heavy cross section of community interest that is represented in this gathering—the pooled skills of staffs and the accumulated influence of boards. Is there not some way in which these can be organized for a revised approach to the over-all, general needs of children—one that will break past the penurious tendencies of short-sighted city and state administrations and produce new programs, such as New York City's Youth Board and the Welfare Council's experimental street clubs? I cite these only as examples of the way in which services have moved boldly to meet young

people at the center of their own interests, rather than wait for them to come, broken and helpless, for a job of mending or reconstruction.

More Preventive Programs Needed

Not all, but many children's agencies stand at present with respect to the needs of children as do hospitals and physicians to the health needs of the community. They are ready to give service when called upon, but they are seldom called upon until the patient is in a bad or desperate condition. The public health center has been established to thin the parade to the hospital. Well-baby clinics have lightened the work-load of the pediatrician. X-ray clinics have kept many a patient from the sanatorium for the tuberculous. Health programs have moved to meet the community at the outset, rather than the last desperate point of need. I say again that the Peckham Health Center provides us with a practical suggestion for similar child care programs, set up to serve not only the health needs of the child, but also his deep-rooted craving for security and enjoyment in the neighborhood extension of his family experience. When we touch him at this advanced point, we are in a position to reach out to the rest of the family and play a much stronger role in shaping the family forces that give the child his start.

In making suggestions such as these, I am not speaking as the incorrigible community organization specialist—if I may draw that term from the field of work in which I am engaged. I speak as a social worker who has an unbounded admiration for the devotion and professional skill of the child care worker and his agency. I have no children, it is true, but out of that lack I may have developed a special concern for children, and may carry a special, continuous, burning fury over the way in which a dull, sodden society has constantly neglected its most precious possession. The jobs that I have held over the past thirty years have brought me much in contact with young people and I know how fine they can be, and how gallant—and how, underneath their careless gallantry, they can be terribly unprotected and helpless and alone.

And I know, out of my own personal and racial experience as well as out of my observation of children of all races, that it is not *privation* that distorts personality growth, but neglect. There is a toughness about young people that goes beyond the ordinary understanding of the self-contented adult and carries with ease a kind of suffering that older people will go to any lengths to avoid. Hunger, cold, lack of material possessions and exclusion from personal comforts—these are by no means the worst that can happen to

children. The worst that can happen is to be afraid, to be unwanted—to be shunted aside with callous indifference in the quest for what every child wants and should have—safety and fun.

More and more, I repeat, it is becoming difficult for furtively frightened family heads to guard children in

the quest for the good things of a child's life. More and more it becomes incumbent upon organized society to extend that protection which the individual family cannot provide. And agencies in the child care field are the means by which a too-often latent impulse can be brought to life and set into vigorous action.

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING FOR CHILD WELFARE FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE AGENCY*

Johanna G. Schenk

District Supervisor
Children's Services
Cleveland, Ohio

Recognizing their urgent need for professionally trained workers, child welfare agencies must take a more active part in this training, Miss Schenk declares. This paper sets forth her clearly thought out conception of just what, specifically, should go into the training of a child welfare worker, both before and after she comes to the agency.

THE professional training of social workers is recognized and acknowledged by both school and agency as their joint responsibility. There is agreement that both school and agency need to work co-operatively, so that one may complement the other and the total program may be geared to a common goal. It is therefore important that both the school and the children's agency each define just what is included in their contribution to the professional training of child welfare workers. Certainly the child welfare agency, in its desire for professionally trained staff, has a large stake in the "finished product."

What then is the role of the children's agency in this training process? Let us consider first those contributions which all social agencies, regardless of their function, make to the professional training of any social worker. It may well begin before the student enters a professional school of social work, and in its fullest sense, continues during all the time the worker is employed at an agency. Through its program every agency confirms the value of professional training through such media as sound philosophy, efficient structure, clearly defined yet flexible policy, Board and administrative acceptance of training, skilled and sensitive practice, competent supervision, provision for staff development and fair personnel practices.

Any agency which hires professionally trained workers also has a responsibility in the recruitment of students through any of several methods. One is the

interpretation of social work to potential students, as an example, such leaflets as "Family Case Work—A Good Profession to Choose,"* in whose preparation an employee of a social agency participated. Another opportunity for interpretation is through the participation by selected agency staff in vocational programs planned by high schools and colleges. This was done annually for seniors at the high school in Whitefish Bay, Wisconsin. The Oberlin (Ohio) Symposium on Occupations for Women annually offers such an opportunity. Perhaps some agency can arrange to have social work thus interpreted also to men students. Some agencies may also plan a "Students' Day" to which seniors in all the undergraduate colleges in the geographic locality are invited to attend an all-day program, one part of which concerns professional training for social work, its goals, its methods and its rewards. The Family Service Association of Cleveland has such a program. With the recent advancement in the use of audio-visual methods of propaganda, education and interpretation, I would wonder whether there might not be some value to having a group of community agencies banded together through the local council of social agencies, or through the professional school in that locality, or a group of agencies with similar function, under the leadership of an organization such as the Child Welfare League of America, produce a film. Perhaps a professional organization, such as the

* Presented at League's Central Regional Conference, Toledo, Ohio, March, 1950.

* Beattie, Anna B., and Hollis, Florence, "Family Case Work—A Good Profession to Choose," New York, Family Welfare Association of America, 1945.

American Association of Social Workers, might more logically take leadership here but children's agencies might well participate in such a project. Such a film might be geared to the recruitment of students for the profession of social work or perhaps interpret the value of professional training to lay people, contributors and board members in the case of private agencies and taxpayers and public officials in the case of public agencies.

An agency also recruits potential students by providing scholarships and grants in aid adequate to help meet the rising costs of training. Enough has been written about the pros and cons of such financial help also carrying a commitment for employment at the agency so that it needs nothing but mention here. This is true also regarding the limited use of loans rather than outright grants, as well as the value of leaves for only one year of professional study.

Selective Use of Untrained Graduates

Without in any way negating our firm conviction of the need for professional training of social workers, we believe that each agency needs to examine its program carefully and determine whether there is not room in it also for the selective use of college graduates who, though without professional training, are eligible for it but need a limited period of at least peripheral experience with social agencies and their clients before they can decide to engage themselves in professional training. Having seen the results of the indiscriminate use of such workers during the war period in private agencies and in the development of public child care, particularly in rural areas, we are well aware of the need to define their activity carefully and limit it firmly to areas within their abilities, but we can nevertheless acknowledge that there is a real contribution which they can make, at the same time that they are getting at least a part of whatever impetus they may need to move them into professional training.*

It seems to me that there is an urgent need for closer co-operation between school and agency. Very obvious is the need for the agency to provide the school with case material for teaching purposes. Agency staff members have convictions about curriculum and want to share in planning it. What better way is there of translating these convictions into action than by providing the school with suitable teaching cases? We at the agency are often guilty of accusing school faculty of becoming perhaps too

"academic," too far removed from actual practice. What do we do about it? Do we offer the teaching personnel an opportunity for employment, either during vacations or on a part-time basis during the school year? Certainly in a children's agency there is room, though possibly not money, for such employment. If casework faculty is willing, there are periodically many intake situations, foster home studies and adoptive studies which can be completed within the academic vacation period of two months. One or two cases involving the placement of children away from their own home, either in adoption, foster home or institutional placement, can be responsibly carried in a few hours a week, if those hours are flexibly fitted into the school and agency programs as well as to the needs of each individual situation. Conversely, if the agency believes the teaching personnel is too academic, it has the responsibility of releasing staff for at least part-time employment on the faculty, either on an extension basis or as visiting lecturers or discussion leaders.

By far the outstanding contribution of the agency to the professional training of social workers is the provision of field experience as an integral part of that training, whether it is concurrent with the academic period or given in the so-called block plan. Academic preparation alone is not enough to prepare the potential social worker for a professional function. The professional worker needs also to have had an experience in which he has an opportunity to apply, to act and to test out, to feel, to think and to integrate into his practice and philosophy the academic concepts learned in the classroom. The student needs a period in which he himself, with personalized help which we call supervision, can experience the application within the framework of a social agency, of what he has learned in school. With the experience of both academic training and supervised field work, the student has an opportunity to acquire and to integrate knowledge, to develop skills and techniques, to gain ease in the use of theory and method; an opportunity to understand his own part in this process, and an opportunity to work out a code of ethics and a personal philosophy consistent with those of the profession.

No More Trial and Error Methods in Supervision

Here again there needs to be closer co-operation between the school and the agency. The selection of the field instructor, responsibility for the training of that supervisor in supervisory method, and help to the supervisor in regard to a specific student's problems in learning need to be more closely shared by school and agency. Supervisory method and, particu-

* *Editor's Note:* See "Untrained Personnel Employed on an Apprentice Basis," by Lucille Lazar, CWLA Bulletin, Dec., 1945; and "Apprentices on the Job," by Bertha Gronfein, CWLA Bulletin, Jan., 1946.

larly, content need to be more clearly defined so that there is a definite body of knowledge which is taught. This means that the agency must provide an opportunity within its program, either with leadership of its own personnel or not, for the supervisor to learn to supervise. It means also that the school must have direct contact with the supervisor regarding specific students, and must as well sponsor workshops, courses, seminars and institutes for supervisors. We must mutually put an end to the trial and error methods to which many of us had to resort in beginning supervision. The question of whether the newest supervisors should be assigned to students needs continued careful consideration by both agency and school.

The contribution of the agency to the field experience of the student begins before the student arrives. It begins when the school sends the personnel material regarding the student to the agency, it continues to the selection of the supervisor, to the preparation of the agency and the supervisor for the student, through a program of orientation to both agency and total community. Adequate provision for the release of time to the supervisor and other agency personnel for work with the student is also necessary. The selection of cases and the sequence and timing of their assignment also must be carefully considered in the training of students. All of this, however, is geared to what it is we are trying to teach the student. Though it is recognized that to a significant degree, this depends on the student himself, what he brings to the experience, his readiness and capacity to learn and to grow, it is also vital for each agency to know just what it is trying to teach.

Omitting any real discussion of method, I should like to attempt instead to define this content. It is my personal belief that training for social work is training for a profession and that the generic content of a field placement in any casework agency must therefore be greater than the specific. Although a field placement in a children's agency provides the opportunity for the integration of certain basic knowledge and the development of certain basic skills which are generic to all fields of social work, it also, however, offers a specialized experience. It is here that I should like to separate the contribution of the field experience in a children's agency from that of any other field placement and devote the remainder of my time to this specialized content, the unique contribution of the children's agency to the professional training specifically of the child welfare worker. It should be noted parenthetically that the contribution of the agency can be validated only if it is accompanied by adequate related curriculum content at the school.

In order to analyze what, specifically, we are trying

to teach, we must examine first what we mean when we speak of child welfare. We are aware that we do not all mean the same thing when we use these words. We are therefore particularly indebted to the Child Welfare League of America, under whose leadership an attempt is being made in various parts of the country to define child welfare. For our purposes, I would like to use the following definition presented by one of the Regional Committees: "That branch of social casework which has to do with the problems of separation or non-separation of children from parents and the care of children during the time they are away from their parents. This would include specifically all types of substitute care, as adoption, boarding care, institutional care, day care and protective service." A comment is added that this would include placements requested voluntarily by parents and also those which follow legal intervention. I would like to suggest the addition to this of some specific mention that child welfare includes not only "the care of children during the time they are away from their parents," but also help to these parents in planning for their children, whether this ends in the re-establishment of the own home or in long-time and perhaps permanent separation.

What Makes a Child Welfare Worker?

This is a definition of what we do in children's agencies; it is also a definition of what we try to teach students. What special knowledge, attitudes and skills need to be added to the student's so-called basic knowledge and skill to change him from a generic caseworker into a specialized child welfare worker? I have previously mentioned that nationally under the leadership of the Child Welfare League there is a project working on the answer to this question. The magnitude of the project is indicative of the magnitude of the question. In order to clarify this, more study and research are needed. Yet, at the risk of oversimplifying this content, I should like to offer the following:

1. It is necessary for the children's worker to have an understanding of family life, with special emphasis on the meaning of parents to children and of children to parents. At first, this may appear to be one of the most fundamental parts of the basic core of knowledge of every social worker, but its specialized content derives from its focus—the meaning of children to parents and of parents to children. This must be known and understood in relation both to our changing culture and to the way in which the community defines the family through its laws regarding parents and children. Since some of the clients of children's agencies are unmarried parents, there must also be knowledge of in what ways unmarried parents are like other parents and in what ways they are different, and skill in working with these differences. There must be a belief in the value of family life; an acceptance of parental rights, including the parents' right to place their child; and a firm conviction about the child's right to have care, at least at

the minimal level defined by law. Casework skill in working with parents, no matter how adequately or inadequately they meet the ideal, as defined for us by our understanding of a child's needs, is implicit as a prerequisite for a child welfare worker.

2. The child welfare worker must have knowledge and understanding of children of all ages, an understanding of the normal growth process, physically, mentally, emotionally and spiritually. He needs a knowledge of what helps this process and what hinders it, a recognition of what is normal and what is not. This knowledge likewise is sterile unless he can also relate to children in such a way that the relationship can be used to help the child. It must especially be emphasized that the child welfare worker must be able to control his identification with the child and must be disciplined in his use of authority, both of which are possible only to the degree that he is comfortable about his own conflicts in the growing-up process in relation to his own parents and siblings, as well as to the larger world outside his family.

3. The child welfare worker will be dealing with parents and with children, but he will be working with them on "the problems of separation or non-separation." There is, therefore, a need for understanding of all the implications of the meaning of separation to parents, to children and to the community. The child welfare worker must have the skill to help the parents consider these implications. This is true not only in cases where the request for placement is a voluntary one by the parents, but also in protective cases where the parents may or may not wish placement. He must accept the parents' right to request placement if they see it as the way in which they can solve their own problems, but he must also have the understanding and skill which will enable him to help the parents understand what separation will mean not only to them but also to the child. The worker must understand the meaning and use of the court, of time limitations, of money, of medical care, of clothing, of parental visiting, and of the actual act of physical separation and placement. All of these have a special meaning for both parents and child. The child welfare worker must therefore develop skill in using them constructively and creatively. He must also understand and accept that unless parental rights have been legally terminated, the child still belongs to the parents. At the same time, he must recognize that while the child is under the care of the agency, responsibility for her on a day-by-day basis rests with the agency. He must therefore be well enough integrated himself to be able to carry this responsibility while he does not consciously or unconsciously try to take the child away from the parents. Conversely, he must be able not only to allow, but also to help the parents give the child to the agency, to him, if it is mutually agreed that this is the best plan for parents and child and if the permanent placement of children is one of the functions of the agency. All of this is possible only if the child welfare worker recognizes that although in meeting the needs of parents and child, a large part of his work is with the adults in the child's life, and rightly so, nevertheless his focus must always be the welfare of the child.

4. Since the child welfare worker is involved with the separation of parents and child, he must know the special characteristics of the various kinds of care possible for a child away from her own home. He must know the special qualities of foster and adoptive homes, of institutions and of day care facilities, the service they each have to offer to the child and to the parents, what family can best be served by each kind of care, and when one kind of care will be helpful and when it will not. He must also have the skill to use this knowledge dynamically in each individual situation. If he is to be able to do this, he must also know why people become foster parents, or adoptive parents, or offer day care to other people's children. He must develop skill in learning how to evaluate potentially good foster or adoptive families. He must be able to work with such people, to help them to determine whether this is

something they really can and want to do; he must then be able to help them work with the agency and eventually to live with a specific child and her family situation.

5. After the child is placed away from her own parents, what then? Because of our increasing understanding of the meaning of placement to the child, to the parents and to the community, we do not see placement as an end in itself. The child welfare worker must have deep conviction that every child needs to belong to a warm, accepting, stable family of her own, either through birth or through legal adoption. Rooted in this conviction, all of the child welfare worker's understanding and skill must be directed toward the achievement of such a family for every child. This means that wherever possible, the child welfare worker's skills must be used to help strengthen the child's own family so that she may perhaps remain there, or if placed she may return to it and find there the security which is her right. Our social action must assure that the community will also support such a goal. Where the child can return to her own family, again the child welfare worker must understand the meaning of the separation to parents and child. Only then can he use his skills to help both parents and child live together again as a wholesome family. It also means that he must have an understanding of the meaning to the child of what she is leaving, so that she can be helped in the transition out of placement and back into her own home. Where for one reason or another, it is impossible for the child to be reunited with her own family, the child welfare worker must develop the skills needed to help the parents recognize just how much parental responsibility they can carry. He must then be able to help the child move into long-time care or into adoption. Finally, both the child and the parents must be helped so that they can live with the decision.

Obviously, no one field placement in any agency is long enough to give the student a firsthand experience with all of these aspects of child welfare, even if the agency program offers them. Nor in so short a time can we expect one student to be able to learn so much, weighted as this content is with deep emotion. Neither do I think the total answer lies in two field placements in a children's agency. The most we can hope to do in the field placement is to give the student as much opportunity as possible to work and to learn through direct experience under competent supervision. The student must be aware of the gaps in his experience. To fill these, the agency must join with the school in helping the student to develop a professional point of view which, combined with his knowledge and skill, his personal integrity, sensitivity, imagination and initiative, will enable him to continue to learn, to grow and to develop his creative skills in the field of child welfare.

But mere recognition of what an agency can contribute to the professional training of child welfare workers is not enough. When we face also how urgent our need for such workers is, we know too that we at the agencies must direct our efforts to carrying our full responsibility in this program. It is only as we succeed in training more professional child welfare workers that we will be able to meet our obligation to provide better and more helpful child welfare services to the community.

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

Defense Related Activities

THE increased tempo of the defense program of necessity affects the welfare of every child; the immediate result is greater tension in and out of family homes. Who will be called away—for what kind of assignment—involving how much risk—leaving behind what kind of day-to-day responsibilities for mother, sister, wife to carry? What self-sacrifice will be essential? How can we protect essential normal relationships, standards of living, not only for the sake of our children but for the morale of our country?

These and other questions are not easy to contemplate, much less to answer. One thing we do know, from past experience: that defense mobilization challenges those who are pledged to work for emotionally healthy development of our children. We know that not only our skies but our children must be protected.

There have been other times in our lives when survival needs surpassed all others. Those experiences taught us that just as we plan on the military plane so we must plan for civilian needs. We are told that the duration may be briefer than five years or longer than ten. We cannot countenance a lost generation of children. As more mothers go to work expanded substitute-care facilities for children become a "must." Day care in family homes for some, in centers for others, institutional care and foster family care, are essentials—and under adequate supervision, if our children are to be protected from wanton neglect.

Increased transiency, partial break-up of home life, because of such factors as employment of both parents, military service, increases the number of children requiring foster care inevitably, while it decreases the number of readily available foster homes. The serious consequences of unwise use of an overcrowding of institutional facilities can only be avoided by appropriate measures to insure enough adequate foster homes.

Foster family care must be provided for children whose parents cannot maintain a home during a period of personal and social upheaval. More babies will be born out of wedlock. Services for their mothers and services for the babies must be provided—placement for some, and for many, adoption. And these mothers, perhaps less able to face realistically the implications of their situation, will need skillful casework services to help them arrive at a solution to their problems that will spell health, physical and emotional, for them and for their children. Protective services will be taxed as they were during the years of World War II. Neglect of children always accompanies periods of social strain and stress. Mothers tempted by the much needed opportunity to add to their family income frequently jeopardize the lives of their children by leaving them uncared for. Skilled protective services will be needed for the children as well as for the parents.

These problems growing out of mobilization are social welfare problems, not limited to the responsibilities of any one group in this broad field. This means that child welfare workers along with their colleagues in family welfare, group work, education, health, housing, and other services, must maintain their role in planning and carrying out programs which will conserve fundamental goals for children within a changed framework of American living. Unless social welfare leaders, lay and professional, are willing to undertake this job on a national as well as on a local level, it will be assumed by others, perhaps less qualified through experience and training to plan for children and families. The task will not be easy either for those social workers who are called to perform new jobs or those who hold the line in agencies. Major professional and organizational changes are inevitable if, because of increased demands for services, we give leadership in the change from peacetime to a mobilization footing. It means expansion or changes in services, recruitment, training of volunteers, some increase in hours of work to carry greater loads. Constant reassessment of our services, for their quality and standards, will be necessary, and the sacrifice to insure that these standards be maintained.

The League has been asked to offer special service in the emergency through the newly formed United Defense Fund. Within the present plan such services as these are to be provided through the United Community Defense Services. No part of the League's normal operating budget is included in the Defense Fund. These are several charted areas of immediate special need.

1. A national publicity campaign for foster homes to back up local foster home finding. Similar publicity on day care demands.
2. Field service, consultation and guidance for defense-impacted communities in the areas of day care, foster family day care, foster care and protective care, and service to unmarried mothers.
3. Training programs including institutes for day care personnel and volunteers.

If we overlook the needs of children, for whom is our defense program? Children's welfare must not be sacrificed with the grim but glib expression "butter to guns." Funds must be found to hold the line of basic social services; to uncover services that were insufficient and inadequate in peacetime; to strengthen and increase these, and to cover unmet needs. Our faith in the American father and mother leads us to believe that only as the children are given the care they need will their parents be able to give their best to the jobs essential for the defense of our country.

Let us not forget that we too are responsible for defense—the defense of our children. In their interest it becomes a patriotic duty to insist on adequate support for social services.

SPENCER H. CROOKES

CONSULTATION SERVICES IN NURSERY SCHOOLS*

A CRITICAL APPROACH

Peter B. Neubauer, M.D.

Ruth Patten Fishman, M.S.

Joseph Steinert, Ph.D.

This very provocative article is the result of a critical study of nursery schools made by a team including educators, pediatricians, psychiatric social workers, psychiatrists and psychologists. One of their most significant findings is that each school has its own personality, its pattern of function and its pattern of resistances.

WHEN we speak of a "mental health program," we refer not only to the treatment of mental pathology but also to the study and treatment of the sources of emotional problems in the community. For several decades psychiatry and the related professions have recognized the crucial importance of early experience in setting patterns for personality and character formation. Yet in spite of this almost universal recognition, comparatively little has been done to focus community health programs on the needs of children. The crucial challenge to the child-rearing professions continues to be how best to strengthen the personality development of the so-called normal child and how to treat children already emotionally disturbed to prevent enduring pathological conflicts.

But what can be done? How might our theoretical understanding be converted to effective mental health services to young children on a community-wide basis? Traditionally, a clinical setting, usually a child guidance agency or a hospital clinic, has provided the means for studying and treating the disturbed young child. An educational setting, usually a nursery school, is used to teach him to relate to others and to his environment according to norms for healthy children.

What are some of the advantages and limitations of such programs? Clinical settings study the child's pathology. Test situations are created to study specific functions. The relationship to the examiner is taken as an indication of a pattern of relationship. Fantasy productions are taken as expressions of dynamic forces. The tools developed are specific clinical tools to arrive at a diagnostic evaluation of pathology. The younger the child, the more obviously these clinical facilities fail. They do not study by direct observation the psychosocial interaction or the growth capacities of the child in his environment. In a nursery school setting these could gainfully be studied.

* Presented at annual meeting of American Orthopsychiatric Association, February, 1950.

In the clinic the establishment of a relationship between the therapist and the preschool child is frequently blocked by difficulties in communication and by other problems—for example, the young child's reluctance to separate from the parent and interact with a strange adult with whom he is closeted briefly perhaps once a week. Granted that the child and the therapist can be brought together and rapport is established, the therapist is often handicapped by sheer lack of reliable knowledge of child development. The nursery school, too, as usually set up would be insufficient to study the child's total personality. Test facilities would have to be added to study dynamic forces and to determine unconscious goals.

There are additional considerations relevant to treatment. In working with the preschool child we know we must treat not only the child but the significant environment. Islands of security in interpersonal relationships must be provided if the growing child is to thrive. And we know the frustration that comes from the inability to isolate and modify the many significant factors that determine his adjustment to living.

Because of such problems of procedure and handling, many child guidance agencies do not treat the preschool child. When they do, the emphasis is placed upon re-education of the parent, which has the hazard of overemphasizing the parents' responsibility for the child's difficulties. Unduly provoked guilt feelings and anxiety can burden, rather than remedy, the child's relationships with his parents. Such an emphasis could minimize focus on other highly significant relationships, such as that between the nursery school teacher and the child; and the ideal of treating the total significant environment is impeded.

Sometimes, as a supplement to the child guidance clinic's services, the child is referred to a nursery school for the "educational aspect" of his training needs. The clinic and the nursery school representing totally different kinds of structures, new problems of "integrating" the services of the two agencies arise.

The clinicians and educators having evolved from different professional disciplines, confusion and misunderstanding result all too often in this otherwise desirable collaboration.

Maladjusted Children Usually Excluded from Schools

Typically, however, there is little relationship between the nursery school and a child guidance clinic. In this pattern, where sole or major responsibility for guiding the child's development rests with the nursery school, harassment, confusion and anxiety may develop in staffs when a child is persistently nonconforming or atypical in his adjustment to the school situation. The tendency is to exclude the maladjusted young child, essential conformity to the school's program and routines becoming the prerequisite for admission. The so-called "disturbed" child is then referred to a clinic or a psychotherapist in the relatively rare instance when suitable resources are available.

Most frequently, however, after the child's dismissal from nursery school, no therapeutic plan whatever is undertaken. The child then takes his chances on being able to develop sufficiently sturdy defenses to enable him to enter a regular school at six years of age. In many localities the public schools are not required to accept six-year-olds who prove to be seriously maladjusted. Consequently, the child most in need of constructive socializing experiences finds such help withheld.

Especially in the preventive aspect of mental health work, the nursery school is strategically important, since it can offer the opportunity for healthful interpersonal experience, not only with children, but also with significant adults. If more children could have such constructive experience, there might be less occasion to categorize preschool children as "normal" and "disturbed." In itself, and without the addition of specific individual treatment, for some children such an experience can prove therapeutic. Much more needs to be studied and known about the implications of this well-known fact.

The services of the Brooklyn Office of the Council Child Development Center were designed to integrate clinical and educational study of the preschool child. One phase of our interest has been to explore the extent to which the introduction of clinical facilities into existing nursery schools would benefit the population of the school as a whole. Traditionally, clinicians in a school setting have diagnosed problem children and given limited therapy where indicated. In this manner, the separation between the normal and the disturbed child has been increased. We were interested in exploring the potentialities of integrat-

ing the clinical and the educational in the so-called normal nursery school.

This paper does not describe the services rendered to the nursery schools nor the process utilized, nor does it elaborate on the function of the specialists on our own team. We decided to broaden the clinical team to include a nursery school educator, a pediatrician, psychiatric social workers, psychologists and psychiatrists. Acting as a mobile team, we went out to the nurseries. We used information about all the children in the nursery, as obtained by the nursery school staff, as well as the information obtained by direct observation, testing, and examination by members of our own staff, working in the school. Consultation with nursery school staffs and direct participation as clinicians are the two methods of gathering data upon which our conclusions are based.

High Proportion of Pathology

When we studied the four schools with which we affiliated, we found a high degree of pathology in the families and children. Whether such findings are peculiar to these schools or would be found universally in nurseries, we cannot state. However, we soon became aware of the fact that the traditional separation of the severely maladjusted from the normal in these schools would have involved a mass exodus to child guidance clinics and family agencies for treatment.

All the nursery schools in which we function are Day Care Centers, deriving from one third to three fourths of their income from city welfare funds. They were originally established to meet problems arising out of wartime conditions and have been continued. Not atypically, in one of our nurseries over one half of the families are broken by divorce, separation, hospitalization or death. In addition, in another one third of the families both parents are employed. In all, about 85 per cent of the children have mothers working outside the home. Although intake selection favors financially deprived families with working mothers, a few limited income cases are served where either parent is incapacitated by physical or emotional illness. Because children are selected primarily on the basis of custodial care, schools must be kept open from 7:30 or 8 a.m. to 6 p.m., although not all children stay all day. No one teacher is usually available to see a child come and leave on any one day. One teacher is provided for ten children, an assistant added for fifteen. We found such conditions prevailing in all four nurseries, subject only to slight variation.

Thus, the three- to six-year-olds spending a long day at the schools were not merely socializing for a few hours with their peers. They were living a signifi-

cant part of their daily life. The need, therefore, to make such a nursery experience educationally meaningful and emotionally enriching was very great.

It might be well to examine how we started in nurseries. Requests for services had come from boards and directors, rather than from teaching staffs. However, teachers greeted us generally with enthusiasm, feeling such service was long overdue in the nursery field and expressing satisfaction that our team was multidisciplined and covered so broad an area.

At our introductory meetings we found staffs had difficulties in formulating how they wanted to use our services. Problems were in most instances very broadly stated. For example, teachers wanted "help with parents and children." Directors wanted to know how to set up an adequate intake policy, how to select children for acceptable grouping, what was normal behavior for children at the 3-, 4-, 5-year levels.

It became obvious that our service was seen as a demonstration project. We were regarded as experts who were expected to observe staffs in their functioning, then confront them with our criticisms. They wished us to take the initiative for choosing problems for study and regarded us in an authoritative role. However, we wanted to work as much as possible through the staff and structure of the school as it existed, with the staff retaining the responsibility where changes were to be made. When we encouraged staffs to define their needs more specifically, in every school teachers selected their most deviant children, described their classroom behavior, and wanted from us formulae for handling.

Each School Has Its Own Personality

As we observed and discussed case material, however, we made one of our most significant findings. Each school has its own individuality, its pattern of function and its pattern of resistances, which goes beyond the capacity or limitations of a particular teacher or group. The relationship of school to community, of director to staff, of teacher to teacher, reflects itself in specific attitudes toward the child. There seems to be a characteristic pattern in each school within which parents, children and staff are expected to adjust to each other. If they do not, consequences also seem to be determined within this framework. If changes in it are indicated, characteristic resistances arise.

It soon became clear that this uniqueness reflects a number of factors. The most important are:

1. The personality of the director.
2. The attitudes of board and community.
3. The interpersonal relationships established within the staff.

Of these, perhaps the most significant is the personality of the director. For example, an autocratic direc-

tor selects her staff in such a way as to minimize independent functioning outside the bounds of what she considers acceptable. What she does to the staff she does also to the parents. Problems are tolerated to the degree to which she can control them. If the director considers the environment too pathological, she excludes it. Parents are "handled" by the director. Contact between parents and teachers is discouraged. The director does not feel she assumes the parental role, but she does feel that she offers the "better" place, which should not be spoiled or overburdened by the parents' problems. Under such auspices it will be almost impossible for the individual teacher, even with the best intentions, to co-operate with or to educate the parents, particularly since she herself is chosen for her degree of conformity. Thus the director's attitude repeats itself in a variety of forms.

An overorderly director rebukes teachers if rooms are not neat. In this setting, oilcloth, newspapers, rags, mops, sponges and other clean-up materials become so omnipresent that spontaneity of play is inhibited. If a child spills water on the floor, teacher mops up immediately, screening off the area used for water play. Children are told this is done to prevent their slipping on the wet floor.

Now we shall describe a pattern which expresses a carry-over of community attitudes into the school without professional modification. This school is located in a community noted for a high degree of informality. Here one verbalizes easily. Promptness and orderliness are neglected. *Laissez-faire* prevails. Teachers and parents have comparatively free contact. Aggressive or destructive behavior by children is tolerated a good deal. However, when the limit of teacher tolerance is reached, they react with particular severity, punish excessively or completely withdraw their affection, which is otherwise easily expressed. This behavior pattern seems to correspond to that prevailing in the homes of the children, and the school perpetuates the cycle of aggression-punishment, permissiveness with guilt, leading to aggression, etc.

Examples of the significance of intrastaff relationships could be multiplied many times. Two teachers having different attitudes toward aggressive behavior are working together in one group. One has little tolerance for aggressive behavior and stops it short as soon as it begins to show itself, indicating its unacceptability. The other teacher feels permissiveness should be the rule, that a child needs a chance to "act out" his conflicts in order to come to a solution. One teacher withdraws into household tasks, leaving the care of the children largely to the other. Thus a well-known parental pattern was again repeated. During this process, upsets and anxiety increase.

Attitudes Toward Expression of Sexual Needs

We should also like to mention forms of behavior which express the general knowledge, or perhaps more accurately, the misconceptions, of the nursery school staff; for instance, the attitudes usually adopted toward expression of sexual needs of the child.

We learned through our discussions that many teachers were caused discomfort by persistent masturbation and mutual sex play among the children, and by erotic aggression openly expressed toward the person of the teacher. On the other hand, they felt they should do nothing overt to interrupt it. When a child surreptitiously touched the teacher's breast or her thigh, by putting his hand under her dress, he was, they felt, seeking love and comfort from them. Since they knew him to be a severely deprived child, they were concerned that stopping him might be construed as rejection. Therefore some teachers accepted this behavior. Others attempted to distract the child without making their attitudes known more directly. One teacher spoke of giving the child "a look" in order to stop him. None had openly accepted the child's sexual interest, but his sex activity was silently accepted.

In discussion, the teachers brought out their feeling that infantile sexuality had to be accepted, and that inhibition would lead to neurotic problems. In spite of their discomfort, they permitted the child full expression, behaving as if this expression had no significance at all, thereby denying it, while permitting full acting out.

The degree to which such patterns existed and were accepted by the teacher group became clear to us as we got to know each nursery better. We might have missed the pervasiveness and significance of such patterns had we confined ourselves to the usual consultation, with its focus on individual case situations. We acquired this understanding through discussion with teachers of individual children and observation of their behavior.

In each school we found studies of individual children slowed at this point. What teachers knew of a child's behavior at school was often broadly stated, omitting a clear picture of what precipitated difficulties, although generally deviant behavior could be described. Together we analyzed running records of the child's functioning, prepared by teachers, showing how he reacted to eating, sleeping, play materials, people, what his fantasies were, where he participated, where withdrew, etc. Efforts were made to avoid seeing these things in isolation, but rather to trace trends and try to understand their significance.

When we attempted to learn about relationships between home and school behavior, we discovered no

really reliable method of adequate communication between teacher and parent had been set up. In some schools definite efforts to avoid such an interchange emerged. This indication re-enforced our thinking that little could be accomplished unless the initial stage of our collaboration was devoted to working with the structure of the nursery and attitudes of staff.

We found that much has to be done to set up lines of communication, both within the school and between schools and parents, schools and boards, schools and communities in which they operate. The significance of board and community attitudes cannot be underestimated, for no program can be continued in a meaningful form, nor modifications within the school undertaken, unless support from these sources is forthcoming.

Consequently, we accepted for discussion at our joint staff conferences the nursery school program as reflected in family-school contact, interstaff responsibilities, etc. While we discussed the individual needs of the child and their expression in behavior, we also studied the goal of the school in relation to the child, and the instruments provided for its attainment. Clarification of the staff's understanding of the relationship between the child's behavior and the functioning of the school was usually undertaken in relation to individual problems.

This paper, which is an outgrowth of staff discussions, has described a mental health program which reaches out to people in their living situations. It concerns the creation of additional facilities to improve everyday functioning without involving a separate therapeutic experience.

Hard to Focus Study on Structure of Programs

It is interesting to note that the professions contributing to our work were, at first, far more interested in studying the individual pathology and needs of the child than in focusing primarily on the structure within which mental health programs have to operate. It seems to be much easier to evaluate individual intrapsychic phenomena than to observe and evaluate external conditions which are reflected in the emotional life of the child. There is no doubt about their interconnection theoretically. However, our training has given us more tools for understanding individual pathology than for measuring values expressed in the ways people relate to each other in social institutions. A shift to acquire new tools and additional professional representation must occur, if we intend to function as consultants in such settings. We need methods which enable us to measure cultural values expressed in the family as well as in the school.

It is true that basic to our professional work is the study of the individual child. But preceding any meaningful treatment of nursery school children must be an appraisal of the modifiability of the structure of the school. By "structure" we refer to the total facilities which the nursery staff makes available to the child, the parent and its own staff. It includes the physical plant and equipment, the program planned for the child, the administrative and supervisory set-up. It refers also to all provisions made for continuous contact with parents and community.

At this point, the following questions arise: How can we translate our own professional skills and methods into the educational field? What methods do we have to effect modification? The problem we face in the nursery is in some respects comparable to those with mothers who bring children for individual therapy. In our discussions with them, we obtain the history and a description of the environment, separations, how many people are around the child and for how long, sleeping arrangements, attitudes toward feeding, playing, etc. However, we realize that a discussion of the child's needs with the mother will bear fruit only if she understands her own role in relationship to them. Similarly, not only do we need to focus on facilities which the nursery makes available, but also on the nursery staff's attitude toward the child as expressed in the facilities offered to him, the daily schedule, the relationship set up with parents. Only then is the way clear for effective treatment of the individual child.

We should like to note here that we are aware that a social institution cannot be described merely in terms of parent-child relationships, but techniques developed through the years of individual treatment can and must be adapted and extended to the setting. Just as in individual therapy we must discover the "dominant" figure within the family, so in the school we must discover the "dominant" figure who sets the characteristic pattern of behavior. As characteristic reactions to the dominant figure are observable in families, so are they observable in staffs, in schools, and in children.

Our current evaluation of the great importance of these patterns of school function has led us to conclude that we failed in our initial efforts to study adequately the school's degree of flexibility before agreeing to affiliation. We would now recommend a trial period of study during which we would discuss the fact that our thinking might suggest modifications in the school's program, and under a modified program changes in personnel might seem indicated. If these preliminaries are not carefully established, disruptive conflicts might ensue.

We function within the limits of an educational

relationship, with the assumption that there is sufficient emotional health in staffs to reach constructive goals in relation to the child. Interpretation of unconscious manifestations as expressed in their attitudes is avoided. The degree to which modification based on dynamic principles can be carried out successfully with educational tools needs further study.

The process employed to modify staff function is similar to the one we have learned to use for some forms of psychotherapy. The whole staff needs first to formulate its educational goal for the child. Secondly, the whole staff needs to know intimately the total set-up created by the school for the child and to understand the effect of each procedure on parents and children. Thirdly, they need to be aware of their feelings of gratification or disappointment in achieving these goals.

Misunderstanding of Psychoanalytic Concepts

We would like at this point merely to touch on the need to understand further the function of each profession represented in the collaboration and its methods. It has been noticed how misunderstood psychoanalytic concepts and procedures have confused progressively oriented nursery schools. Methods which had been used for specific purposes, permitting aggressive tendencies and free expression of fantasy life, have been adopted by teachers who do not have at their command, and do not need to have, techniques for interpretation of these unconscious manifestations. At such point, as the boundary between therapy and education becomes blurred, uncertainty appears in the teacher, and confusion is brought to the child and to parents.

The schools with which we work offer tremendous advantages to children. They offer facilities for activities. The homes from which these children come can never offer the social and physical stimulation which is made possible there. Important contributions are made to the maturation process, such as adequate food, rest periods, social interaction, the possibility of group experience, and very often a teacher who shows greater stability than the parent. Certainly, there can be no doubt that the nursery experience can make an important contribution to a child's life.

Summary

This paper has attempted to emphasize and develop three points:

1. *The necessity for fusion of the traditional child guidance and nursery school interests.*

In order to achieve this, we broadened the clinical team and went with it into the nursery school to give service.

2. *The necessity for dealing with a nursery school as a unit.*

Our observations indicated to us that equal significance must be given to a child's maturational needs, the structure of the nursery, child-school, and school-community interaction. The consultant who deals with any one of these factors can give helpful service. For example, a supervisor of nursery school teachers can make valuable programming suggestions. A psychiatrist might diagnose and explain the behavior of an individual child. However, unless such specialists relate to the program more broadly, they automatically accept limitations in their effectiveness.

3. *Patterns of function are expressed in each school and determine the way in which that school meets the child's needs.*

The study of the modifiability of these patterns becomes of primary importance to consultants.

We feel that our experience should benefit all those consultants who will in increasing numbers work in educational settings to foster prevention of emotional problems. It should discourage those who offer services as consultants to schools or other institutions from participating in the discussion of the client or the child without accepting as a prerequisite the social setting as the client.

A NOTE TO CHILD PLACING AGENCIES—

From the Fact Finding Report of the Midcentury White House Conference

AMONG the difficulties of family life, the ones that are likely to rank highest for children are those that require that they go to live with strangers.

Arranging for and supervising the foster care of children has become a complicated and skilled undertaking. There is need throughout for a careful balancing between attending to parent's and child's feelings in the matter and numerous practical details. The experience, it has been found, is unlikely to be a helpful one to a child unless it is undertaken with his parent's or relative's real desire, especially if the occasioning factor has been the child's difficult behavior.

Next in importance to trying to understand each particular child is the enormous value to each child of some continuing connection with his own family. The connection may be maintained by correspondence, gifts, visits and in other ways. Unless it exists, even with a third cousin twice removed, the secret desolation of most children is almost unreachable and is likely to fuel an insatiable desire to minimize the present and to seek a never-never past.

By all odds, the most important single element in social service provisions for children who have to live away from home is the quality of the people recruited as foster parents, in or out of institutions.

The kind of arrangements—foster home or institution of one or another sort—is also very important, as well as what is asked of children in those arrange-

ments. Most children are ready to try to make a connection with adults and to try to understand what they regard as acceptable behavior. . . . They may want mothering—and fathering, too, for that matter. But they are likely to resent adults who try to compete with or displace their memories and phantasies about their own parents.

Some children have been so riddled emotionally that they cannot get along in any family.

All in all, then, there is much knowledge about what children require in order to benefit from life away from home, and there are some fine examples of good services. The country over, however, this knowledge is not put to use as fully as might be desired. There are still far too many institutions and foster-home programs that operate without enough regard for children's and parents' psychology and that hinder rather than help personality development.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

THE fifth annual State Wide Institute on Children's Institutions will be held at the Hotel Sherman in Chicago on March 12th and 13th. This interesting and widely attended conference designed to serve the institutional field is perhaps the most highly developed of its kind in the country.

Started in 1947 it has grown to the point where last year some 600 persons representing the boards and staffs of 84 of Illinois' approximately 150 institutions were in attendance. The Committee on Children's Institutions of the Welfare Council of Chicago assumes major responsibility for the planning of the conference and is its chief sponsor. Among the co-sponsors is the CWLA.

This important conference is rendering a great service in an all too neglected area. Included in its program are special sessions and workshops for institutional executives and board members, for house-parents and for caseworkers in an institutional setting. The Committee on Children's Institutions believes that the institute has had a notable and clearly evident influence on the programs of children's institutions in their state. It has allowed for extensive examination of every facet of institutional care and administration, and has been successful in helping to integrate the work of board and staff, caseworkers and houseparents. The experience of this conference should be of value to other states in their efforts to raise standards of institutional care.

The League will take part in this conference through the participation of two of its staff members, John Dula and Joseph Reid, who will be leading workshops.

CONFERENCES

N.B.—The Eastern Regional Conference which was to be held on February 8, 9, 10, in Baltimore, Maryland, was cancelled on January 30, by action of the conference committee. Details will appear in the next issue of *CHILD WELFARE*.

The Southern Regional Conference is scheduled for February 15, 16, 17, 1951, at Biloxi, Mississippi. Headquarters will be the Buena Vista Hotel. Miss Sara L. Ricks, Director, Division of Child Welfare, Mississippi State Department of Public Welfare, is chairman.

The Central Regional Conference will be held March 15, 16, 17, 1951, in Dayton, Ohio. Miss Katherine J. Dunn, Supervisor of Casework, is chairman. Headquarters will be the Hotel Biltmore.

The new South Pacific Regional Conference will be held on April 18, 19, 20, 1951, at the Hotel Huntington, Pasadena, California. Mrs. Kendal Frost, board member, Child Welfare League of America, is chairman.

The Southwest Regional Conference will be held on April 26, 27, 28, 1951, at Topeka, Kansas. The chairman is Mr. Anthony DeMarinis, Director, Family and Children's Service, St. Louis, Missouri. Miss Marie C. Scott, Executive Director, Kansas Children's Service League, Topeka, Kansas, is co-chairman.

The New England Regional Conference will be held May 28 and 29, 1951, at Portsmouth, New Hampshire. Headquarters will be the Hotel Wentworth-by-the-Sea. Mr. Robert M. Mulford, General Director, Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Boston, is chairman.

The Midwest Regional Conference will be held at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, June 21, 22, 23, 1951. Headquarters will be the Hotel Schroeder. Mr. Fred Delli-Quadri, Director, Division of Child Welfare and Youth Service, Wisconsin State Department of Public Welfare, is chairman.

The National Conference of Social Work will be held May 13-18, 1951, in Atlantic City. The League's headquarters will be at the Hotel Traymore. The program chairman is Miss Janice Bowen, Executive Director, Child and Family Service, Portland, Maine. The co-chairman is Miss Marie C. Smith, Director, Child Welfare Division, Colorado State Department of Public Welfare, Denver, Colorado.

BOOK NOTES

PUBLIC HEALTH IS PEOPLE, by Ethel L. Ginsberg. The Commonwealth Fund, New York. 1950. 241 pp. with Index. \$1.75.

For two weeks in July, 1948, at Berkeley, California, an institute on mental health was sponsored jointly by the California State Department of Public Health and the Commonwealth Fund of New York. It was for health officers primarily, in co-operation with psychiatrists, leaders in public health, and psychiatrically oriented pediatricians.

The Commonwealth Fund had previously participated actively in six such institutes elsewhere in the United States, with the purpose of helping "the students understand, accept and integrate knowledge about human behavior and emotional needs that will enable them to function more effectively as physicians, nurses, teachers, or members of other professions engaged in serving people." Mrs. Ginsberg keeps clear the integrity of purpose of these institutes, and at the same time captures a quality of timing and setting that is quite remarkable.

As observed and recorded by Mrs. Ginsberg, this Berkeley institute was as lively and perplexing as it was seriously professional. It was a refresher course in the best traditional manner. The faculty, so-called, was good, and the students, so-termed, even better. The setting was superlative, the participants playful and professional, and the respect for authority unusual. All learned from one another: who learned the most, students or faculty, was a hard question.

This book is an excellent account of pioneering with professionals and dramatizes how they somewhat dubiously began to collaborate in a group activity, became personally identified and professionally alerted, and derived security from participation with their colleagues. Great respect was given to interpersonal relationships; but community mores, administrative obstructions and hard-riding personalities were lashed into.

Mrs. Ginsberg lets the participants speak for themselves. She portrays their early apprehensions, their resistance to dynamic concepts, the group reaction to newly identified perceptions, and the gradual integration of ideas. What they learned about people one may learn to his professional advantage in the field of public welfare and social service. The art and task of interviewing and recording, the features of specialized services (working with crippled children, tuberculosis and venereal disease), the emotional factors in the use of authority, administration and community organization are made as exciting as they are expositional.

This book, small as it is, with only 241 pages, has background, content and atmosphere in abundance. It is factually convincing and as absorbing as fiction. *Public Health Is People* should be read as a growth-

orienting experience along with Walter Clark's *The Ox-Bow Incident*. It contains dialogue exchange between participants when conflict and doubt mount the highest. The zest for individual integrity and welfare makes the teaching an inspiration. Mrs. Ginsberg has a keen appreciation for the quality of sincerity in *Public Health Is People*. She has let others see for themselves what a teaching process an institute can be if well-planned and sponsored.

The Berkeley institute, as outlined and reported by Mrs. Ginsberg, has great merit as a teaching device because it reveals the dynamics of reconciling the skeptical and the accepting, both of whom have their conflicting tolerances and intolerances. For those in practical casework and social welfare administration who are perplexed about motivation, it is an accurate and good text. Schools of social work that are struggling with their didactic supervision of students, and the therapeutic teaching and testing of students in their field work placements, would find Mrs. Ginsberg's account a refreshing concept: *That a living experience shared for only two weeks among individuals of professional stature and student status is vastly more important and may be a greater teacher to all than are many prescribed courses and an orderly sequence of rigidly fixated study.*

HERBERT E. CHAMBERLAIN, M.D.
Consulting Psychiatrist, Sacramento, Cal.

THE HANDICAPPED CHILD, by Edith M. Stern with Elsa Castendyck. A. A. Wyn, Inc., New York. 1950. 177 pp. \$2.00.

The authors of this book present the problems of the handicapped child from a different approach than that usually taken. Addressed to the parent of a handicapped child, it demonstrates clearly and convincingly that good principles of child rearing apply equally to the normal and the handicapped.

Realistically, yet sympathetically, the authors take up the relationship between parent and handicapped child, the fitting of the child into the family group, and ways of helping him acquire an attitude toward life which will enable him to grow up happy and useful. In the first chapter, "Your Child and You," various aspects of parental feelings of guilt and anxiety are considered, feelings common to all parents, in a way that is both reassuring and therapeutic.

It is obvious that Edith M. Stern is thoroughly familiar with the principles of mental hygiene. She attempts to dispel the feeling that a cripple should be an object of pity, pointing out that pity may become overwhelming and engulf the parent to such an extent that the child as a whole is lost sight of and only his handicap is recognized. She writes, "Pity, however sincere and well-intentioned, is not good for anyone, straight or deformed, crippled or sound of

limb. Because it is bestowed on those considered less fortunate or less able than the one who does the pitying, it makes its object feel inferior. It further weakens the weak, and it causes those singled out to receive it for their 'difference' to feel the more different. As a parent, you have much better things to give your child than pity."

Before discussing specific handicaps found in children, she instructs the parent in recognizing the importance of giving the handicapped child every possible chance to make his own decisions, to promote a child's thinking of doing things for himself and also of doing as much as he possibly can for others.

The chapter dealing with the cerebral palsied child contributes no particularly new ideas to the widely discussed care of these children, but it does enlighten the parent in the proper handling of such children in the home. Helpful suggestions are also made in the case of epilepsy occurring in a child.

The various facilities available to children with impaired vision and hearing difficulties are outlined, with special directions to parents and other members of the household for helping these handicapped children.

To the parent of the mentally retarded child, many sound ideas are offered. The disappointments experienced by parents of retarded children and the self-reproach common to such parents are discussed in a genuinely helpful way.

The authors make a valuable contribution in the discussion of the management of the child with rheumatic fever or heart disease. All too often, the great emphasis placed upon the physical impairment associated with these conditions tends to develop psychological problems in the child and in the parent-child relationship which are far greater than the disease itself. In this chapter it is clearly pointed out that the rheumatic child can be spared the emotional disturbances so often undesirable sequels of this disease. Physicians, as well as parents, can derive helpful hints about the management of rheumatic children from this chapter.

This compact, well-organized book should be in the hands of every parent who has a handicapped child. The statements are accurate and well documented. The mental hygiene aspect of the handicap is never overlooked. Teachers, physiotherapists, nurses and others interested in handicapped children can receive valuable aid from this book. As a physician interested in children, I found it profitable reading. I commend it to physicians with similar interests. In the literature in the field of child welfare it will find a significant place and should receive widespread attention.

ALBERT D. KAISER, M.D.

Professor, Child Hygiene
University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry

MAKE IT YOURSELF! Handicraft for Boys and Girls. By Bernice Wells Carlson. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, N. Y.-Nashville. 1950. 160 pp. \$1.35.

"Make It Yourself!" gives many answers to the ever ringing question, "What can I do?"

Parents, teachers and group leaders of children from preschool age through twelve years of age will find many helpful suggestions. Even the nursery child begins to discover his creative ability. So it is the adult's role to direct his gift of creativity by providing opportunities for creative activities and learning experiences. As a child's outlook is widened, so better human relationships are formed.

Children often show us something they want to say which enables us to know how they feel on the inside. One of the most rewarding ways of understanding a child is to watch his activities.

Bernice Carlson says in the beginning:

"Would you like a new toy, a gift to give a friend, an instrument for your toy band, a party favor, or a greeting card? Then make it yourself. You can!"

"You can work alone. Or, you can work in a group with friends, older brothers and sisters, or your parents. Ten-year-old boys and girls, and younger ones, have made every article in this book. You will find that the directions are easy. No one has to be an artist to follow them."

The easier projects are found at the beginning of the book and the simple illustrations are most helpful in understanding the directions.

The materials suggested to use are easy to find at home or are inexpensive. In fact, many items suggested are those that are usually discarded. You will find the alphabetical index listing materials as well as items to make, or recipes for finger painting, paste, etc.

The simplicity throughout the book in every way is most appealing. So, Make It Yourself!

LOIS HANCOCK

Supervisor, Osgood Sanders Day Nursery of the Sheltering Arms Association of Day Nurseries, Atlanta, Georgia

CLASSIFIED AD SERVICE

Insertion of five lines of six words each is made at the minimum rate of \$2.50. For each additional line, or a fraction thereof, the charge is 50 cents. Closing date is the eighth of the month prior to the month of issue. A check should accompany the order.

DISTRICT CONSULTANTS and child welfare workers with full graduate training and experience for expanding program in rural state. Write Child Welfare Director, Department of Public Assistance, Box 1189, Boise, Idaho.

ADOPTION WORKER. Graduate training and experience, for private statewide child-placing agency. Iowa Children's Home Society, 206 Savs. & Loan Bldg., Des Moines 9, Iowa.

ADOPTION WORKER—Graduate accredited school plus child-placing experience, by nonsectarian adoption agency. Expanding program. Good supervision and psychiatric consultation available. Salary range \$2800-\$3500. Boston Children's Friend Society, 123 Marlborough St., Boston 16, Mass.

SUPERVISOR WANTED in family and children's agency with adoption, child placement and family casework services. Professional staff of six. Student training program. Good personnel policies. Write United Family and Children's Society, 703 Watchung Ave., Plainfield, N. J.

SUPERVISORY AND CONSULTANT openings in expanding public welfare program. Graduate training and experience required. Field representative for integrated field service, salary range \$4080-\$4800; child welfare consultant, \$4080-\$4800; child welfare supervisor of district office, \$3540-\$4260. Nevada State Welfare Department, P.O. Box 1331, Reno, Nev.

CHILD PLACEMENT WORKER in a multiple function agency. Graduate training required. Some experience preferred. Excellent supervision, psychiatric consultation. Progressive working conditions. Salary range \$2950-\$4700. Jewish Social Service Bureau, 5737 Second Ave., Detroit 2, Mich.

CASEWORKER WANTED in family and children's agency with adoption and child placement services. Full professional training required. Experience preferred. Student training program. Good personnel practices. Salary \$2700-\$3600. Write United Family and Children's Society, 703 Watchung Ave., Plainfield, N. J.

CASEWORKER—Opening for professionally trained caseworker in children's agency specializing in temporary foster home care. Salary range \$2950-\$3950. Write Miss Merle E. MacMahon, Windham Children's Service, 2112 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y.

CASEWORKER AND SUPERVISOR—skills in child welfare an advantage. Multiple service agency. Provisional member of CWLA and member of FSAA. Psychiatric consultation, student program, excellent help in developing supervisory skills available. Salary in accord with training and experience. An opportunity to participate in the continuing development of agency program. Write Family and Children's Bureau, 337 South High St., Columbus 15, Ohio.

CASEWORKER for child placement agency. Trained. Experience with foster care, unwed parents and adoptions preferred. CWLA member. Consulting psychiatrist. Close supervision and limited load. Student unit. Salary range \$2700-\$3900. Children's Bureau, 225 N. Jefferson St., Dayton, Ohio.

CASEWORKER for large, well-established progressive agency for the blind, with professionally staffed multiple service program and workshops. Qualifications include degree from accredited school of social work and minimum three years' successful experience in social agency of recognized standing. Applicants whose experience includes work with the blind will be given preference. Good salary. Write Mrs. Ruth G. Baldwin, Director of Social Services, Pittsburgh Branch, Pennsylvania Association for the Blind, 308 South Craig St., Pittsburgh 13, Pa.

ADOPTION WORKER—graduate training and experience, for private city and county child placing agency; salary commensurate with training and experience, from \$2900. Children's and Family Bureau, 400 W. Hill Ave., Knoxville, Tenn.

CASEWORKER, WOMAN, for integrated family and children's program (including children's institution) on edge of Pocono Mountain vacation area. Salary \$2000-\$2720 according to qualifications. Write United Charities, 107 Madison Ave., West Hazleton, Pa.

PLEDGE TO CHILDREN

As its closing action, the Midcentury White House Conference unanimously adopted the following pledge:
TO YOU, our children, who hold within you our most cherished hopes, we the members of the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, relying on your full response, make this pledge:

- From your earliest infancy we give you our love, so that you may grow with trust in yourself and in others.
- We will recognize your worth as a person and we will help you to strengthen your sense of belonging.
- We will respect your right to be yourself and at the same time help you to understand the rights of others, so that you may experience cooperative living.
- We will help you to develop initiative and imagination, so that you may have the opportunity freely to create.
- We will encourage your curiosity and your pride in workmanship, so that you may have the satisfaction that comes from achievement.
- We will provide the conditions for wholesome play that will add to your learning, to your social experience, and to your happiness.
- We will illustrate by precept and example the value of integrity and the importance of moral courage.
- We will encourage you always to seek the truth.
- We will provide you with all opportunities possible to develop your own faith in God.
- We will open the way for you to enjoy the arts and to use them for deepening your understanding of life.
- We will work to rid ourselves of prejudice and discrimination, so that together we may achieve a truly democratic society.
- We will work to lift the standard of living and to improve our economic practices, so that you may have the material basis for a full life.
- We will provide you with rewarding educational opportunities, so that you may develop your talents and contribute to a better world.
- We will protect you against exploitation and undue hazards and help you grow in health and strength.
- We will work to conserve and improve family life and, as needed, to provide foster care according to your inherent rights.
- We will intensify our search for new knowledge in order to guide you more effectively as you develop your potentialities.

As you grow from child to youth to adult, establishing a family life of your own and accepting larger social responsibilities, we will work with you to improve conditions for all children and youth.

Aware that these promises to you cannot be fully met in a world at war, we ask you to join us in a firm dedication to the building of a world society based on freedom, justice and mutual respect.

SO MAY YOU grow in joy, in faith in God and in man, and in those qualities of vision and of the spirit that will sustain us all and give us new hope for the future.

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, Inc.

24 West 40th Street, New York 18, N. Y.

Officers

LEONARD W. MAYO, President
NEW YORK

MRS. RICHARD J. BERNHARD, 1st Vice-Pres.
NEW YORK

MISS E. MARGUERITE GANE, 2d Vice-Pres.
BUFFALO

MISS EMMA C. PUSCHNER, 3d Vice-Pres.
ST. LOUIS

C. F. RAMSAY, 4th Vice-Pres.
ANN ARBOR

MISS GRACE A. REEDER, Secretary
ALBANY

SPENCER H. CROOKES, Exec. Dir.
JOSEPH H. REID, Asst. Exec. Dir.

MRS. HERBERT F. FISHER, Treasurer
HARTFORD

Board of Directors

MRS. RICHARD L. BOWDITCH, Cambridge, Mass.
MRS. GEORGE P. EDMONDS, Wilmington, Del.
GEORGE FAHEY, Seattle, Washington
MRS. KENDAL FROST, Los Angeles, Calif.
MRS. JOE HUME GARDNER, Washington, D. C.
ALAN S. GEISMER, Cleveland, Ohio
SHELBY M. HARRISON, New York, N. Y.
C. ELLIS HENICAN, New Orleans, La.
DR. HERMAN E. HILLEBOE, Albany, N. Y.

MRS. HENRY HITCHCOCK, St. Louis, Mo.
MRS. J. HORTON IJAMS, New York, N. Y.
ROBERT L. KINNEY, New York, N. Y.
REV. JOHN J. LENNON, New York, N. Y.
MISS KATHARINE F. LENROOT, Washington, D. C.
ROBERT McDUGAL, Jr., Chicago, Ill.
MRS. CHARLES S. MONROE, New York, N. Y.
THOMAS M. PETERS, New York, N. Y.
RANDEL SHAKE, Indianapolis, Ind.

WALTER N. THAYER, New York, N. Y.
WALTER P. TOWNSEND, Philadelphia, Pa.
MALCOLM VILAS, Cleveland, Ohio
MRS. GEORGE L. WEST, Pittsburgh, Pa.
MISS LOIS WILDY, Chicago, Ill.
ROBERT W. WILLIAMS, Philadelphia, Pa.
MRS. RAY W. WILLOUGHBY, San Angelo, Texas
KERNS WRIGHT, Van Wert, Ohio
BENJAMIN YOUNGDAHL, St. Louis, Mo.